



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,367	06/23/2000	Jean-Jacques Berard	740332.90032	9080
7590	04/08/2004		EXAMINER	
Nicholas J. Seay Quarles & Brady LLP P O Box 2113 Madison, WI 53701-2113			LETT, THOMAS J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/602,367

Applicant(s)

BERARD ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Lett

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

New corrected drawings are required in this application because drawings are not formal. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the terms "data base" should be changed to read "database" (p13, lines 11, 12, and 13). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "data bases" should be changed to read "databases" (p7, line 15; p9, line 7).

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "data base" should be changed to read "database" (p3, lines 7, 12; p7, lines 15, 17, 25, 26, 28, 29; p8, line 29; and p9, line 7). .

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "access" should be changed to read "accessed" (p7, line 27).

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "sated" should be changed to read "stated" (p8, line 11).

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "access" should be changed to read "accesses" (p8, line 22).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "data base" should be changed to read "database" (p11, line 17). Appropriate correction is required.
8. Claim 7 objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "data base" should be changed to read "database" (p12, lines 4 and 5). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2626

9. Claim 1, 2, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogawa et al (US Patent 5,608,874). Ogawa et al teaches of a method capable of file format translation and transmission.

Regarding claim 1, Ogawa et al disclose:

- (a) FIG. 10 shows one embodiment of the invention in which the provider data file is a fax transmission of a paper document sent to Main Processing Section 20 by a subscriber to the system (col 27, lines 57-60), which reads on receiving a document from a user to be transmitted to a recipient;
- (b) a MidFormat File--a data file that has been translated into a format common to all data files of that particular type, prior to being converted to a Destination Format (col 5, lines 26-28), which reads on testing the document against a set of previously defined rules to assign to the document a document type from a set of previously identified document types;
- (c) a Midformat File that originates as a translated Provider Data File created by the PreProcessor, and it contains a list of delimited transactions (col 5, lines 28-29), which reads on extracting data from the document, based on previously defined rules associated;
- (d) this file is translated by the PostProcessor into a Destination Format in order to load it into a Subscriber's application software (col 5, lines 30-32), which reads on sending the document by facsimile transmission to that destination if the extracted data identifies the intended destination of the document;
- (e) a Subscriber Table--A database file containing subscriber information such as

Art Unit: 2626

Subscriber ID number, Subscriber Name, Job Number, Translation Information, Subscriber Destination Address, and subscriber Filename Information (col 6, lines 39-42). If the number captured, represents a valid Provider Section 10, Main Processing Section 20 allows the transfer of Provider Data files 115 from Provider 10 to Main Processing Section 20 (col 13, lines 28-32). This database, as with any database, contains fields together with a set of operations for sorting, querying and other functions, which reads on sending a query to a database containing destination information associated with a predefined set of recipients, the query identifying the recipient and requesting as a response a destination associated with the intended recipient, and upon receiving a response to the query, sending the document by electronic transmission to that destination.

Regarding claim 2, Ogawa et al disclose that forms processing systems perform the following steps: accept an input file in the form of a fax or scanned image of a document, identify the type of document represented, align the image, locate each field of information, extract each field, segment or cut between the characters, perform character recognition, such as by OCR (Optical Character Recognition) and/or ICR (Intelligent Character Recognition) (col 27, lines 30-37), which reads on a method wherein the document type is identified by the name of the file containing the document.

Claim 7 is rejected as being obvious, as the computer system of Ogawa et al is suitable for an LDAP database because Ogawa et al may use alternative methods of communication and electronic mail between separately located sections of this system. They include the use of on-line services such as CompuServe, America Online,

Art Unit: 2626

Prodigy, or infrastructures such as the Internet, or the Information Superhighway, each with their respective electronic mail and file transfer capabilities (col 11, lines 50-55). A user could add LDAP to their existing directories without much trouble. This reads on the database of recipients is an LDAP database.

Regarding claim 8, Ogawa et al disclose a Provider Data File 115 is received at Main Processing Section 20 in the form of a scanned image, such as via a fax transmission (col 26, lines 42-44); which reads on the electronic transmission is by facsimile transmission.

Regarding claim 9, Ogawa et al disclose using a modem, Provider Section 10 can either directly transmit Provider Data Files 115 to Main Processing Section 20, or electronically mail this information. Of course, there are many other means of electronic data transmission known in the art that are also suitable for this purpose, within the framework of the present invention(col 11, lines 42-47), which reads on the electronic transmission of the document is by e-mail transmission.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al (US Patent 5,608,874) in view of Wakai et al (US Patent 6,697,165).

Art Unit: 2626

Ogawa et al disclose FIG. 10 shows one embodiment of the invention in which the provider data file is a fax transmission of a paper document sent to Main Processing Section 20 by a subscriber to the system (col 27, lines 57-60); a MidFormat File--a data file that has been translated into a format common to all data files of that particular type, prior to being converted to a Destination Format (col 5, lines 26-28); a Midformat File that originates as a translated Provider Data File created by the PreProcessor, and it contains a list of delimited transactions (col 5, lines 28-29); this file is translated by the PostProcessor into a Destination Format in order to load it into a Subscriber's application software (col 5, lines 30-32); a Subscriber Table--A database file containing subscriber information such as Subscriber ID number, Subscriber Name, Job Number, Translation Information, Subscriber Destination Address, and subscriber Filename Information (col 6, lines 39-42). If the number captured, represents a valid Provider Section 10, Main Processing Section 20 allows the transfer of Provider Data files 115 from Provider 10 to Main Processing Section 20 (col 13, lines 28-32). This database, as with any database, contains fields together with a set of operations for sorting, querying and other functions. Ogawa et al do not disclose expressly a method wherein the document type is recognized by a text string contained the document. Wakai et al disclose that for slips, at the top of which character strings describing the slip type are printed, the document type can be easily determined by the OCR on the employing upper portion of the sheet. (col 47, lines 4-8). Ogawa et al and Wakai et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of information processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 2626

ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Wakai et al to Ogawa et al in order to obtain file-identifying information from a document. The motivation for doing so would be to identify a document type. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wakai et al with Ogawa et al for the benefit of document recognition to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Regarding claim 5, Ogawa et al do not disclose expressly a method wherein during the data extraction step, if instructed to do so by the rules associated with that document type, searching the document for a character string associated with destination information. Wakai et al disclose that information defined in the tables in FIGS. 88 and 89 is employed to compare a character string included in an input document with a character string defined in a character string column in the table, and the conception in a corresponding column, a Role for further specifying the meaning, and a Condition for specifying succeeding information, or an instructed process Action are acquired, and analysis for them is performed (col 40, lines 4-12). Ogawa et al and Wakai et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of information processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Wakai et al to Ogawa et al in order to obtain destination information from a document. The motivation for doing so would be to use particular character string data to determine a document destination. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wakai et al with Ogawa et al for the benefit of obtaining destination information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Ogawa et al do not disclose expressly a method wherein during the data extraction step, if instructed to do so by the rules associated with the document type, searching the document for a recipient identifier. Wakai et al disclose a document is read by a scanner 701 in Austin, a user designates an addressee by voice, etc., or an addressee that is described using a character string or a bar code on a cover sheet is read and recognized/interpreted to determine the addressee (col 10 , lines 63-67). Ogawa et al and Wakai et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of information processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Wakai et al to Ogawa et al in order to obtain destination information from a document. The motivation for doing so would be to use particular character string data to determine a document destination. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wakai et al with Ogawa et al for the benefit of extracting routing information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al (US Patent 5,608,874) in view of Michelman et al (US Patent 6,487,567). Ogawa et al do not disclose expressly a method wherein the system organizes the document by pages based on rules associated with the document type. Michelman et al disclose a method for manipulating page-breaks in an electronic document. The first process involves accepting the input of commands for selecting and moving a page-break within an electronic document. This is referred to as the User Interface Process. The second process is performed in response to moving a page-break to a new location (col 8, lines

Art Unit: 2626

59-63). The rules are based on the specification of the program that operates with the User Interface Process (e.g., Microsoft Word, Excel, or other program). Ogawa et al and Michelman et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of document processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Michelman et al to Ogawa et al in order to organize the pages of a document. The motivation for doing so would be to organize a document's pages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wakai et al with Ogawa et al for the benefit of document manipulation to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Lett whose telephone number is 703-305-8733. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached at 703-305-4863. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 09/602,367

Page 11

Art Unit: 2626

Washington, DC 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II

2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

TJL

(TJL)

KA Williams

KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER